

# ON LOCALLY COMPACT SEMITOPOLOGICAL 0-BISIMPLE INVERSE $\omega$ -SEMIGROUPS

OLEG GUTIK

**ABSTRACT.** We describe the structure of Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroups with compact maximal subgroups. In particular, we show that a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with a compact maximal subgroup is either compact or topologically isomorphic to the topological sum of its  $\mathcal{H}$ -classes. We describe the structure of Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroups with a monothetic maximal subgroups. In particular we prove the dichotomy for  $T_1$  locally compact semitopological Reilly semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  with adjoined zero and with a non-annihilating homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ :  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is either compact or discrete. At the end we discuss on the remainder under the closure of the discrete Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  in a semitopological semigroup.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Further we shall follow the terminology of [10, 13, 17, 42]. By  $N$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  we denote the set of all non-negative integers and the set of positive integers, respectively. In this paper if we do not assume other all topological spaces are Hausdorff. If  $A$  is a subset of a topological space  $X$  then by  $\text{cl}_X(A)$  and  $\text{int}_X(A)$  we denote the closure and interior of  $A$  in  $X$ , respectively.

A subset  $A$  of a topological space  $X$  is called *regular open* if  $\text{int}_X(\text{cl}_X(A)) = A$ .

We recall that a topological space  $X$  is said to be

- *semiregular* if  $X$  has a base consisting of regular open subsets;
- *compact* if each open cover of  $X$  has a finite subcover;
- *locally compact* if each point of  $X$  has an open neighbourhood with the compact closure;
- *Čech-complete* if  $X$  is Tychonoff and there exists a compactification  $cX$  of  $X$  such that the remainder  $cX \setminus c(X)$  is an  $F_\sigma$ -set in  $cX$ .

It is obvious that every Hausdorff locally compact space is semiregular and Čech-complete (see [17, Section 3.9]).

Given a semigroup  $S$ , we shall denote the set of idempotents of  $S$  by  $E(S)$ . A semigroup  $S$  with the adjoined zero will be denoted by  $S^0$  (cf. [13]).

A semigroup  $S$  is called *inverse* if for every  $x \in S$  there exists a unique  $x^{-1} \in S$  such that  $xyx = x$  and  $yxy = y$ . Later such element  $y$  we shall denote by  $x^{-1}$  and call *inverse of  $x$* . A map  $\text{inv}: S \rightarrow S$  which poses every  $s \in S$  its inverse is called *inversion*.

If  $S$  is a semigroup then we shall denote the subset of idempotents in  $S$  by  $E(S)$ . If  $S$  is an inverse semigroup then  $E(S)$  is closed under multiplication and we shall refer to  $E(S)$  a *band* (or the *band of  $S$* ). If the band  $E(S)$  is a non-empty subset of  $S$ , then the semigroup operation on  $S$  determines the following partial order  $\leq$  on  $E(S)$ :  $e \leq f$  if and only if  $ef = fe = e$ . This order is called the *natural partial order* on  $E(S)$ . A *semilattice* is a commutative semigroup of idempotents. A semilattice  $E$  is called *linearly ordered* or a *chain* if its natural order is a linear order. A chain  $L$  is called an  $\omega$ -chain if  $L$  is isomorphic to  $\{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$  with the usual order  $\leq$ .

*Date:* March 7, 2017.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 22A15, 54D45, 54H10; Secondary 54A10, 54D30, 54D40.

*Key words and phrases.* Semigroup, semitopological semigroup, topological semigroup, bicyclic monoid, locally compact space, zero, compact ideal, bisimple semigroup, 0-bisimple semigroup.

A *semitopological (topological) semigroup* is a Hausdorff topological space with separately continuous (continuous) semigroup operations. An inverse topological semigroup with continuous inversion is called a *topological inverse semigroup*.

A topology on a semigroup  $S$  is called:

- *semigroup* if  $(S, \tau)$  is a topological semigroup;
- *shift-continuous* if  $(S, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup; and
- *inverse semigroup* if  $(S, \tau)$  is an inverse topological semigroup with continuous inversion.

The *bicyclic semigroup* (or the *bicyclic monoid*)  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  is the semigroup with the identity 1 generated by two elements  $p$  and  $q$  subject only to the condition  $pq = 1$ . The bicyclic monoid is a combinatorial bisimple  $F$ -inverse semigroup and it plays the important role in the algebraic theory of semigroups and in the theory of topological semigroups. For example the well-known Andersen's result [1] states that a (0-)simple semigroup with an idempotent is completely (0-)simple if and only if it does not contain the bicyclic semigroup. The bicyclic semigroup admits only the discrete semigroup topology and if a topological semigroup  $S$  contains it as a dense subsemigroup then  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  is an open subset of  $S$  [15]. Bertman and West in [8] extend this result for the case of Hausdorff semitopological semigroups. In [6, 7, 11, 12, 18, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 36] these topologizability results were extended to some generalizations of the bicyclic semigroup. Stable and  $\Gamma$ -compact topological semigroups do not contain the bicyclic semigroup [2, 30]. The problem of an embedding of the bicyclic monoid into compact-like topological semigroups discussed in [4, 5, 26].

In [15] Eberhart and Selden proved that if the bicyclic monoid  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  is a dense subsemigroup of a topological monoid  $S$  and  $I = S \setminus \mathcal{C}(p, q) \neq \emptyset$  then  $I$  is a two-sided ideal of the semigroup  $S$ . Also, there they described the closure the bicyclic monoid  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  in a locally compact topological inverse semigroup. The closure of the bicyclic monoid in a countably compact (pseudocompact) topological semigroups studied in [5].

In the paper [22] it was proved that if  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on the bicyclic semigroup with adjoined zero  $\mathcal{C}^0 = \mathcal{C}(p, q) \cup \{0\}$  such that  $(\mathcal{C}^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup, then  $\tau$  is either compact or discrete. Also there was shown that the similar statement holds for a locally compact semitopological bicyclic semigroup with an adjoined compact ideal and constructed an example of a Čech-complete first countable topological inverse bicyclic semigroup with adjoined non-isolated zero which is not compact. Also, the above result of [22] was extended by Bardyla in [6] to the case of a  $\lambda$ -polycyclic monoid  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$ : *if  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on a  $\lambda$ -polycyclic monoid  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$  such that  $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup, then  $\tau$  is either compact or discrete.*

Let  $S$  be a monoid and  $\theta: S \rightarrow H_S(1)$  a homomorphism from  $S$  into the group of units  $H_S(1)$  of  $S$ . The set  $N \times S \times N$  with the semigroup operation

$$(i, s, j) \cdot (m, t, n) = (i + m - \min\{j, m\}, \theta^{m - \min\{j, m\}}(s)\theta^{j - \min\{j, m\}}(t), j + n - \min\{j, m\}),$$

where  $i, j, m, n \in N$ ,  $s, t \in S$  and  $\theta^0$  is an identity map on  $S$ , is called the *Bruck–Reilly extension* of the monoid  $S$  and it will be denoted by  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$ . We observe that if  $S$  is a trivial monoid (i.e.,  $S$  is a singleton set), then  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  is isomorphic to the bicyclic semigroup  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  and in case when  $\theta: S \rightarrow H_S(1)$  is an annihilating homomorphism (i.e.,  $\theta(s) = 1_S$  for all  $s \in S$ , where  $1_S$  is the identity of the monoid  $S$ ), then  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  is called the *Bruck semigroup* over the monoid  $S$  [9].

For arbitrary  $i, j \in N$  and non-empty subset  $A$  of the semigroup  $S$  we define subsets  $A_{i,j}$  and  $A_{i,j}^0$  of  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  as follows:  $A_{i,j} = \{(i, s, j) : s \in A\}$  and  $A_{i,j}^0 = A_{i,j} \cup \{(i + 1, 1_S, j + 1)\}$ .

A regular semigroup  $S$  is  $\omega$ -regular if  $E(S)$  is isomorphic to the  $\omega$ -chain and  $S$  is *bisimple* if  $S$  consists of a single  $\mathcal{D}$ -class.

The construction of the Bruck semigroup over a monoid was used in [9] for the proof of the statement that every semigroup embeds into a simple monoid. Also Reilly and Warne prove that every bisimple regular  $\omega$ -semigroup is isomorphic to the Bruck–Reilly extension of some group [41, 47], i.e., for every bisimple regular  $\omega$ -semigroup  $S$  there exists a group  $G$  and a homomorphism  $\theta: G \rightarrow G$  such that  $S$  is isomorphic to the Bruck–Reilly extension  $\mathbf{BR}(G, \theta)$ . A bisimple regular  $\omega$ -semigroup is called Reilly

semigroup [40]. Later similar as in the Petrich book [40], the Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{BR}(G, \theta)$  we shall denote by  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)$ .

Gutik constructed a topological analogue of the Bruck construction in [19]. Also in [19, 21] he studied the problem of a topologization of the Bruck semigroup over a topological semigroup. Selden described the structure of locally compact bisimple regular  $\omega$ -topological semigroups and studies the closures of such semigroups in locally compact topological semigroups in [43, 44, 45]. In the paper [25] topologizations of the Bruck–Reilly extension  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  of a semitopological semigroup  $S$  which turns  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  to be a semitopological semigroup are studied.

An inverse semigroup  $S$  is called a 0-bisimple  $\omega$ -semigroup if  $S$  has two  $\mathcal{D}$ -classes:  $S \setminus \{0\}$  and  $\{0\}$ , and  $E(S) \setminus \{0\}$  is order isomorphic to the  $\omega$ -chain. The results of the Lallement and Petrich paper [32] imply that every 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup is isomorphic to the Reilly semigroup with adjoined zero  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$ .

In this paper we describe the structure of Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroups with a compact maximal subgroup. In particular, we show that a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with a compact maximal subgroup is either compact or topologically isomorphic to the topological sum of its  $\mathcal{H}$ -classes. We describe the structure of Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroups with a monothetic maximal subgroups. In particular we prove the dichotomy for a locally compact  $T_1$ -semitopological Reilly semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  with adjoined zero and with a non-annihilating homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ :  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is either compact or discrete. At the end we discuss on the remainder under the closure of the discrete Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  in a semitopological semigroup.

## 2. ON A TOPOLOGICAL BRUCK–REILLY EXTENSION OF A SEMITOPOLOGICAL MONOID

Later we need the following proposition which is a simple generalization of Lemma 1.2 from [39] and follows from Theorem XI.1.1 of [40].

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $S$  be an arbitrary monoid and  $\theta: S \rightarrow H_S(1)$  a homomorphism from  $S$  into the group of units  $H_S(1)$  of  $S$ . Then a map  $\eta: \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(p, q)$  defined by the formula  $\eta(i, s, j) = q^i p^j$  is a homomorphism and hence the relation  $\eta^\natural$  on  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  defined in the following way*

$$(i, s, j)\eta^\natural(m, t, n) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad i = m \quad \text{and} \quad j = n$$

*is a congruence.*

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\tau_{\mathbf{BR}}$  be a topology on  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  such that the set  $S_{i,j}$  is open in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  for all  $i, j \in N$ . Then  $\eta^\natural$  is a closed congruence on  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ .*

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary non- $\eta^\natural$ -equivalent elements  $(i, s, j), (m, t, n) \in \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$ . Then the definition of the relation  $\eta^\natural$  implies that  $S_{i,j} \cap S_{m,n} = \emptyset$ . Since  $S_{i,j}$  and  $S_{m,n}$  are open disjoint neighbourhoods of the points  $(i, s, j)$  and  $(m, t, n)$  in the topological space  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ , Proposition 2.1 implies that  $\eta^\natural$  is a closed congruence on  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\mathfrak{STG}$  be a some class of semitopological semigroups and  $(S, \tau_S) \in \mathfrak{STG}$ . If  $\tau_{\mathbf{BR}}$  is a topology on  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  such that  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}}) \in \mathfrak{STG}$  and for some  $i \in N$  the subsemigroup  $S_{i,i}$  with the topology restricted from  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  is topologically isomorphic to  $(S, \tau_S)$  under the map  $\xi_i: S_{i,i} \rightarrow S: (i, s, i) \mapsto s$  then  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  is called a *topological Bruck–Reilly extension* of  $(S, \tau_S)$  in the class  $\mathfrak{STG}$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  be a topological Bruck–Reilly extension of a semitopological semigroup  $(S, \tau_S)$  in the class of Hausdorff semitopological semigroups. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (i) *for all non-negative integers  $i, j, m, n$  the restrictions  $\phi_{m,n}^{i,j}|_{S_{i,j}}: S_{i,j} \rightarrow S_{m,n}: x \mapsto (m, 1_S, i) \cdot x \cdot (j, 1_S, n)$  and  $\phi_{i,j}^{m,n}|_{S_{m,n}}: S_{m,n} \rightarrow S_{i,j}: x \mapsto (i, 1_S, m) \cdot x \cdot (n, 1_S, j)$  are mutually invertible homeomorphisms of subspaces  $S_{i,j}$  and  $S_{m,n}$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ ;*

- (ii) for all non-negative integers  $i, m$  the restrictions  $\phi_{m,m}^{i,i}|_{S_{i,i}}: S_{i,i} \rightarrow S_{m,m}: x \mapsto (m, 1_S, i) \cdot x \cdot (i, 1_S, m)$  and  $\phi_{i,i}^{m,m}|_{S_{m,m}}: S_{m,m} \rightarrow S_{i,i}: x \mapsto (i, 1_S, m) \cdot x \cdot (m, 1_S, i)$  are mutually invertible topological isomorphisms of semitopological subsemigroups  $S_{i,i}$  and  $S_{m,m}$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ ;
- (iii) the homomorphism  $\theta: S \rightarrow H_S(1)$  is a continuous map;
- (iv) for all non-negative integers  $i, j, m, n$  the restrictions  $\phi_{m,n}^{i,j}|_{S_{i,j}^0}: S_{i,j}^0 \rightarrow S_{m,n}^0: x \mapsto (m, 1_S, i) \cdot x \cdot (j, 1_S, n)$  and  $\phi_{i,j}^{m,n}|_{S_{m,n}^0}: S_{m,n}^0 \rightarrow S_{i,j}^0: x \mapsto (i, 1_S, m) \cdot x \cdot (n, 1_S, j)$  are mutually invertible homeomorphisms of subspaces  $S_{i,j}^0$  and  $S_{m,n}^0$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ ;
- (v) if  $\theta: S \rightarrow H_S(1)$  is an annihilating homomorphism then for all non-negative integers  $i, m$  the restrictions  $\phi_{m,m}^{i,i}|_{S_{i,i}^0}: S_{i,i}^0 \rightarrow S_{m,m}^0: x \mapsto (m, 1_S, i) \cdot x \cdot (i, 1_S, m)$  and  $\phi_{i,i}^{m,m}|_{S_{m,m}^0}: S_{m,m}^0 \rightarrow S_{i,i}^0: x \mapsto (i, 1_S, m) \cdot x \cdot (m, 1_S, i)$  are mutually invertible topological isomorphisms of semitopological subsemigroups  $S_{i,i}^0$  and  $S_{m,m}^0$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ ;
- (vi) for every positive integer  $i$  the left and right shifts  $\rho_{(i,1_S,i)}: \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta) \rightarrow \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta): x \mapsto x \cdot (i, 1_S, i)$  and  $\lambda_{(i,1_S,i)}: \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta) \rightarrow \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta): x \mapsto (i, 1_S, i) \cdot x$  are retractions, and hence  $(i, 1_S, i)\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$ ,  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)(i, 1_S, i)$  are closed subsets and  $S_{0,0}$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ ;
- (vii) for every positive integer  $i$  the sets  $S_{0,i}$  and  $S_{i,0}$  are open in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ ;
- (viii) for any non-negative integer  $k$  and for every positive integer  $i$  the sets  $S_{0,k} \cup S_{1,k+1} \cup \dots \cup S_{i,k+i}$  and  $S_{k,0} \cup S_{k+1,1} \cup \dots \cup S_{k+i,i}$  are open in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ .

*Proof.* Assertions (i) and (ii) follow from the definition of the semigroup  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  and separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ .

(iii) Since  $(i, s, i) \cdot (i+1, 1_S, i+1) = (i+1, (s)\theta, i+1)$  for any  $s \in S$ , assertions (i) and (ii), separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  imply that the homomorphism  $\theta: S \rightarrow H_S(1)$  is a continuous map, because the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 S_{i,i} & \xrightarrow{\rho_{(i+1,1_S,i+1)}} & S_{i+1,i+1} \\
 \xi_i^{-1} \uparrow & & \downarrow \xi_{i+1} \\
 S & \xrightarrow{\theta} & S
 \end{array}$$

commutes, where  $\rho_{(i+1,1_S,i+1)}$  is the right shift on the element  $(i+1, 1_S, i+1)$  in the semigroup  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$ .

(iv) Since  $(n, 1_S, i)(i+1, 1_S, j+1)(j, 1_S, m) = (n+1, 1_S, m+1)$  assertion (iv) follows from the definition of the semigroup  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$ , the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  and item (iii).

(v) If  $\theta: S \rightarrow H_S(1)$  is the annihilating homomorphism then it is obvious that  $S_{i,i}^0$  is a subsemigroup of  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  for any non-negative integer  $i$  such that  $(i+1, 1_S, i+1)$  is zero of  $S_{i,i}^0$ , and next we apply item (iv).

(vi) The semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  implies that

$$(i, 1_S, i) \cdot (m, s, n) = (m, s, n) \quad \text{and} \quad (m, s, n) \cdot (i, 1_S, i) = (m, s, n), \quad \text{for all integers } m, n \geq i,$$

and

$$(i, 1_S, i) \cdot (m, s, n) = (i, (s)\theta^{i-m}, i+n-m) \neq (m, s, n) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(m, s, n) \cdot (i, 1_S, i) = (i-n+m, \theta^{i-n}, i) \neq (m, s, n), \quad \text{for all non-negative integers } m, n < i.$$

Then the above arguments, [17, Exercise. 1.5.C], Hausdorffness of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  and separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  imply our assertion.

(vii) Item (iv) implies that  $S_{0,0} \cup S_{0,1} \cup \dots \cup S_{0,i}$  and  $S_{0,0} \cup S_{1,0} \cup \dots \cup S_{i,0}$  are open subsets of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ . Suppose to the contrary that there exists an element  $(0, s, i) \in S_{0,i}$  such that  $V \not\subseteq S_{0,i}$  for every open neighbourhood  $V$  of the point  $(0, s, i)$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ . The above arguments imply that without loss of generality we may assume that  $V \subseteq S_{0,0} \cup S_{0,1} \cup \dots \cup S_{0,i}$ . Then  $(0, s, i) \cdot (i, 1_S, 0) =$

$(0, s, 0)$ , item (vi) and the separate continuity of the semigroup operation on  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  imply that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U$  of the point  $(0, s, i)$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  such that  $U \cdot (i, 1_S, 0) \subseteq S_{0,0}$ . But,  $(0, t, j) \cdot (i, 1_S, 0) = (i - j, (t)\theta^{i-j}, 0) \notin S_{0,0}$  for every positive integer  $j < i$  and any  $t \in S$ , a contradiction. Hence  $S_{0,i}$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ . Similar arguments show that  $S_{i,0}$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ , too.

(viii) Fix an arbitrary non-negative integer  $k$ , an arbitrary positive integer  $i$  and any element  $(k + i, s, i) \in S_{k+i,i}$ . Then we have that  $(k + i, s, i) \cdot (i, 1_S, 0) = (k + i, s, 0)$  and hence the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  and item (vii) imply that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V$  of the point  $(k + i, s, i)$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  such that  $V \cdot (i, 1_S, 0) \subseteq S_{i,0}$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that

$$V \subseteq \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta) \setminus ((k + i + 1, 1_S, k + i + 1)\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta) \cup \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)(i + 1, 1_S, i + 1)).$$

Fix an arbitrary  $(m, t, n) \in V$ . Then we have that  $m \leq k + i$  and  $n \leq i$ . This implies that

$$(m, t, n) \cdot (i, 1_S, 0) = (m + i - n, (t)\theta^{k+1-n}, 0) \in S_{k+i,0},$$

and hence  $m = k + n$ . Now, by induction we have that  $S_{k,0} \cup S_{k+1,1} \cup \dots \cup S_{k+i,i}$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$ . The proof of openness of the set  $S_{0,k} \cup S_{1,k+1} \cup \dots \cup S_{i,k+i}$  in  $(\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{BR}})$  is similar.  $\square$

Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 3.3.8 of [17] imply the following

**Corollary 2.5.** *Every Hausdorff semitopological bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup  $S$  is topologically isomorphic to a topological Bruck–Reilly extension  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{B}})$  of a semitopological group  $(G, \tau_G)$  in the class of Hausdorff semitopological semigroups. Moreover, if  $S$  is locally compact then  $(G, \tau_G)$  is a locally compact topological group.*

We observe that the continuity of the group operation and inversion in a locally compact semitopological group  $(G, \tau_G)$  follows from well-known Ellis' Theorem (see [16, Theorem 2]).

The following corollary describes the structure of 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroups and it follows from Theorem 4.2 of [38] (also see corresponding statements in [32] and [33]).

**Corollary 2.6.** *Every 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup  $S$  is isomorphic to a Reilly semigroup with adjoined zero  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 = \mathbf{B}(G, \theta) \sqcup \{0\}$ .*

Later in this paper by  $\mathbf{0}$  we shall denote zero of a Reilly semigroup with adjoined zero  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$ .

By Theorem 3.3.8 from [17] every open subspace of a locally compact space is locally compact and hence Corollaries 2.5 and 2.6 imply the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Every Hausdorff semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup  $S$  is topologically isomorphic to a topological Bruck–Reilly extension  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  of a semitopological group  $(G, \tau_G)$  with adjoined zero (not necessary as an isolated point) of a semitopological group  $(G, \tau_G)$  in the class of Hausdorff semitopological semigroups. Moreover, if  $S$  is locally compact then  $(G, \tau_G)$  is a locally compact topological group.*

### 3. ON LOCALLY COMPACT SEMITOPOLOGICAL 0-BISIMPLE INVERSE $\omega$ -SEMIGROUPS WITH COMPACT MAXIMAL SUBGROUPS

In this section we describe the structure of Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroups with compact maximal subgroups.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $S$  be a Hausdorff semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with compact maximal subgroups. Then every non-zero  $\mathcal{H}$ -class of  $S$  is an open-and-closed subset of  $S$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.7 there exist a compact semitopological group (which by the Ellis Theorem is a topological group [16])  $(G, \tau_G)$  and a continuous homomorphism  $\theta: G \rightarrow G$  such that the semitopological semigroup  $S$  is topologically isomorphic to a topological Bruck–Reilly extension  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  of  $(G, \tau_G)$  with an adjoined zero. It is obvious that every non-zero  $\mathcal{H}$ -class of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  coincides

with  $G_{i,j}$  for some  $i, j \in N$ . Then items (ii) and (vi) of Proposition 2.4 imply the assertion of the lemma.  $\square$

For an arbitrary group  $G$  and a homomorphism  $\theta: G \rightarrow G$  from  $S$  we define a map  $\eta: \mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0 = \mathcal{C}(p, q) \cup \{0\}$  by the formulae  $\eta(i, s, j) = q^i p^j$  and  $\eta(0) = 0$ , for  $s \in S$  and  $i, j \in N$ . Then by Proposition 2.1 so defined map  $\eta$  is a homomorphism and hence the relation  $\eta^\sharp$  on  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)$  defined in the following way

$$(i, s, j)\eta^\sharp(m, t, n) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad i = m \quad \text{and} \quad j = n, \quad \text{and} \quad 0\eta^\sharp 0$$

is a congruence on the semigroup  $\mathbf{BR}(S, \theta)^0$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  be a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup with a compact group of units. Then  $\eta^\sharp$  is a closed congruence on  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary non- $\eta^\sharp$ -equivalent non-zero elements  $(i, s, j)$  and  $(m, t, n)$  of the Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  with adjoined zero. Then  $G_{i,j}$  and  $G_{m,n}$  are open-and-closed neighbourhoods of the points  $(i, s, j)$  and  $(m, t, n)$  in the space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$ , respectively, such that  $\eta^\sharp \cap (G_{i,j} \times G_{m,n}) = \emptyset$ . Also, the above arguments imply that  $G_{i,j} \times (\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \setminus G_{i,j})$  is an open-and-closed neighbourhood of the ordered pair  $((i, s, j), 0)$  in  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \times \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  with the product topology which does not intersect the congruence  $\eta^\sharp$  of semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$ . Hence we get that  $\eta^\sharp$  is a closed congruence on the semitopological semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$ .  $\square$

Later we need the following notions. A continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  from a topological space  $X$  into a topological space  $Y$  is called:

- *quotient* if the set  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open in  $X$  if and only if  $U$  is open in  $Y$  (see [37] and [17, Section 2.4]);
- *hereditarily quotient* (or *pseudoopen*) if for every  $B \subset Y$  the restriction  $f|_B: f^{-1}(B) \rightarrow B$  of  $f$  is a quotient map (see [34, 35, 3] and [17, Section 2.4]);
- *open* if  $f(U)$  is open in  $Y$  for every open subset  $U$  in  $X$ ;
- *closed* if  $f(F)$  is closed in  $Y$  for every closed subset  $F$  in  $X$ ;
- *perfect* if  $X$  is Hausdorff,  $f$  is a closed map and all fibers  $f^{-1}(y)$  are compact subsets of  $X$  [46].

Every perfect map is closed, every closed map and every hereditarily quotient map are quotient [17]. Moreover a continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  from a topological space  $X$  onto a topological space  $Y$  is hereditarily quotient if and only if for every  $y \in Y$  and every open subset  $U$  in  $X$  which contains  $f^{-1}(y)$  we have that  $y \in \text{int}_Y(f(U))$  (see [17, 2.4.F]).

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  be a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup with a compact group of units. Then the quotient natural homomorphism  $\eta: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is an open map.*

*Proof.* If  $U$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  such that  $U \not\ni 0$  then  $\eta(U)$  is an open subset of  $\mathcal{C}^0$ , because  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  is a discrete open subset of the space  $\mathcal{C}^0$  (see [8, Proposition 1]).

Suppose  $U$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  such that  $U \ni 0$ . Put  $U^* = \eta^{-1}(\eta(U))$ . Since  $\eta: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is a natural homomorphism we have that  $U^* = \eta^{-1}(\eta(U^*))$  and

$$U^* = \bigcup \{G_{i,j}: G_{i,j} \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \cup U.$$

The last equality and Lemma 3.1 implies that  $U^*$  is an open subset of the space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  and since  $\eta: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is a quotient map and  $U^* = \eta^{-1}(\eta(U^*))$ , we conclude that  $\eta(U)$  is an open subset of the space  $\mathcal{C}^0$ .  $\square$

The following simple example from the paper [22] shows that on the semigroup  $\mathcal{C}^0$  there exists a topology  $\tau_{\text{Ac}}$  such that  $(\mathcal{C}^0, \tau_{\text{Ac}})$  is a compact semitopological semigroup.

**Example 3.4** ([22]). On the semigroup  $\mathcal{C}^0$  we define a topology  $\tau_{\text{Ac}}$  in the following way:

- (i) every element of the bicyclic monoid  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  is an isolated point in the space  $(\mathcal{C}^0, \tau_{\text{Ac}})$ ;
- (ii) the family  $\mathcal{B}(0) = \{U \subseteq \mathcal{C}^0: U \ni 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{C}(p, q) \setminus U \text{ is finite}\}$  determines a base of the topology  $\tau_{\text{Ac}}$  at zero  $0 \in \mathcal{C}^0$ ,

i.e.,  $\tau_{Ac}$  is the topology of the Alexandroff one-point compactification of the discrete space  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  with the remainder  $\{0\}$ . The semigroup operation in  $(\mathcal{C}^0, \tau_{Ac})$  is separately continuous, because all elements of the bicyclic semigroup  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  are isolated points in the space  $(\mathcal{C}^0, \tau_{Ac})$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup with a compact group of units. Then the quotient semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0/\eta^\natural$  with the quotient topology is topologically isomorphic to either  $(\mathcal{C}^0, \tau_{Ac})$  or the discrete semigroup  $\mathcal{C}^0$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.2 every non-zero  $\mathcal{H}$ -class of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  is an open-and-closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  and hence the quotient space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)/\eta^\natural$  is Hausdorff. Since the natural homomorphism  $\eta: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is a quotient map Lemma 3.3 implies that the natural homomorphism  $\eta$  is an open map. By Theorem 3.3.15 from [17],  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0/\eta^\natural$  with the quotient topology is a locally compact space. Then Theorem 1 of [22] implies the statement of our lemma.  $\square$

Lemma 3.5 implies the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup with a compact group of units and an isolated zero  $0$ . Then the topological space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  is homeomorphic to topological sum of its  $\mathcal{H}$ -classes with induced from  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  topologies, i.e.,*

$$(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0) = \bigoplus \{G_{i,j}: i, j \in N\} \oplus \{0\}.$$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup with compact maximal subgroups and a non-isolated zero  $0$ . Then for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  there exist finitely many non-zero  $\mathcal{H}$ -classes  $G_{i,j}$ ,  $i, j \in N$ , such that  $G_{i,j} \cap U(0) = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that there exists open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  such that  $G_{i,j} \cap U(0) = \emptyset$  for infinitely many non-zero  $\mathcal{H}$ -classes  $G_{i,j}$ ,  $i, j \in N$ . Then by Lemma 3.3 the quotient natural homomorphism  $\eta: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is an open map, and hence the quotient semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0/\eta^\natural$  with the quotient topology is neither compact nor discrete, which contradicts Lemma 3.5. The obtained contradiction implies the statement of the lemma.  $\square$

Later, for any subset  $A$  of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  we denote  $[A]_{i,j} = A \cap G_{i,j}$ , where  $i, j \in N$ .

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup with a compact group of units and a non-isolated zero  $0$ . Then for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  and any non-negative integer  $i_0$  the sets*

$$\{j \in N: G_{i_0,j} \not\subseteq U(0)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{j \in N: G_{j,i_0} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$$

*are finite.*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that there exist a open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in the space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  and a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that the set  $\{j \in N: G_{i_0,j} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$  is infinite. Since the topological space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  is locally compact without loss of generality we may assume that the closure  $\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))$  of  $U(0)$  is compact and the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  is regular open.

We consider the following two cases:

- (1) there exists a non-negative integer  $j_0$  such that  $[U(0)]_{i_0,j} \neq G_{i_0,j}$  for all  $j \geq j_0$ ;
- (2) for every positive integer  $k$  there exists a positive integer  $n > k$  such that  $[U(0)]_{i_0,n} = G_{i_0,n}$ .

Suppose case (1) holds. Since every maximal subgroup of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  is compact Proposition 2.4(ii) implies that without loss of generality we may assume that  $j_0 = 0$ . By Lemma 3.1 every  $\mathcal{H}$ -class  $G_{i,j}$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  and hence the set

$$\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0)) = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in N} [\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))]_{i_0,j}$$

is compact. Then by Lemma 3.1 the family  $\mathcal{U}_{i_0} = \{\{U(0)\}, \{G_{i_0,j}: j \in N\}\}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0))$  and hence there exists a positive integer  $j_1$  such that  $[U(0)]_{i_0,n} = [\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))]_{i_0,n}$

for all  $n \geq j_1$ . Since  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  is a semitopological semigroup there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  such that  $V(0) \cdot (1, 1_G, 0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $V(0)$  is a full preimage of the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  under the right shift  $\rho_{(1, 1_G, 0)}: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0: x \mapsto x \cdot (1, 1_G, 0)$ . Then by Lemma 3.1 the family  $\mathcal{V}_{i_0} = \{\{V(0)\}, \{G_{i_0, j}: j \in N\}\}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0))$  and hence there exists a positive integer  $j_2 \geq j_1$  such that  $[V(0)]_{i_0, n} = [U(0)]_{i_0, n} = [\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))]_{i_0, n}$ , for all integers  $n \geq j_2$ . Now, the semigroup operation in  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  implies that  $(i_0, g, j) \cdot (1, 1_G, 0) = (i_0, g, j-1)$  for all positive integers  $j$  and any  $g \in G$ . This implies that

$$[U(0)]_{i_0, n+1} = [V(0)]_{i_0, n+1} = [U(0)]_{i_0, n} = [\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))]_{i_0, n},$$

for all integers  $n \geq j_2$ . We put

$$\tilde{U}(0) = U(0) \setminus (G_{i_0, 0} \cup \dots \cup G_{i_0, j_2-1}).$$

Then by Lemma 3.1,  $\tilde{U}(0)$  is an open neighbourhood of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  such that  $[\tilde{U}(0)]_{i_0, n} = [U(0)]_{i_0, n} = [\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))]_{i_0, n}$ , for all integers  $n \geq j_2$ . Since the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  is a regular open set,  $\tilde{U}(0)$  is a regular open set, too. This implies that there exist  $g, h \in G$  such that  $(i_0, g, n) \notin [U(0)]_{i_0, n}$  and  $(i_0, h, n) \in [U(0)]_{i_0, n}$ , for all integers  $n \geq j_2$ . The semigroup operation in  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  implies that  $(i_0, gh^{-1}, i_0) \cdot (i_0, h, n) = (i_0, g, n)$ , for all integers  $n \geq j_2$ . Put  $W(0)$  is a full preimage of the neighbourhood  $\tilde{U}(0)$  under the left shift  $\lambda_{(i_0, gh^{-1}, i_0)}: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0: x \mapsto (i_0, gh^{-1}, i_0) \cdot x$ . Since  $G$  is a group and  $gh^{-1} \neq 1_G$  we have that

$$[\tilde{U}(0)]_{i_0, n} \setminus [W(0)]_{i_0, n} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad [W(0)]_{i_0, n} \setminus [\tilde{U}(0)]_{i_0, n} \neq \emptyset,$$

for all integers  $n \geq j_2$ . Then by Lemma 3.1 the family  $\mathcal{W}_{i_0} = \{\{W(0)\}, \{G_{i_0, j}: j \in N\}\}$  is an open cover of  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0))$  which has no a finite subcover. This contradicts the compactness of  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0))$ , and hence the set  $\{j \in N: G_{i_0, j} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$  is finite.

Suppose case (2) holds. Then there exists an infinite sequence of positive integers  $\sigma = \{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$j \in \sigma \quad \text{if and only if} \quad [U(0)]_{i_0, j} = G_{i_0, j} \quad \text{and} \quad [U(0)]_{i_0, j-1} \neq G_{i_0, j-1}.$$

Since every maximal subgroup of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  is compact Lemma 3.1 implies that every  $\mathcal{H}$ -class  $G_{i, j}$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  and hence the set

$$\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0)) = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in N} [\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))]_{i_0, j}$$

is compact. Put  $V(0)$  is a full preimage of the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  under the right translation  $\rho_{(1, 1_G, 0)}: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0: x \mapsto x \cdot (1, 1_G, 0)$ . Then by Lemma 3.1 the following family  $\mathcal{V}_{i_0} = \{\{V(0)\}, \{G_{i_0, j}: j \in N\}\}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0))$ . Then the continuity of the right shift  $\rho_{(1, 1_G, 0)}$  implies that  $[V(0)]_{i_0, j} \neq G_{i_0, j}$ . Hence the open cover  $\mathcal{V}_{i_0}$  of  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0))$  does not contain a finite subcover, which contradicts the compactness of  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}^0(U(0))$ , and hence the set  $\{j \in N: G_{i_0, j} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$  is finite.

The proof of the statement that the set  $\{j \in N: G_{j, i_0} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$  is finite, is similar.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup with a compact group of units and a non-isolated zero  $0$ . Then for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  the set  $\{(i, j) \in N \times N: G_{i, j} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$  is finite and hence there exists a finite sequence  $(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_m, j_m)$  in  $N \times N$  such that  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \setminus (G_{i_1, j_1} \cup \dots \cup G_{i_m, j_m}) \subseteq U(0)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  such that the set  $A_{U(0)} = \{(i, j) \in N \times N: G_{i, j} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$  is infinite. Then Lemma 3.8 implies that for every positive integer  $k$  there exists  $(i, j) \in A_{U(0)}$  such that  $i > k$  and  $j > k$ . Since the topological

space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  is locally compact without loss of generality we may assume that the closure  $\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))$  of  $U(0)$  is compact and the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  is regular open.

By induction we define an infinite sequence  $\{(i_n, j_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of elements of the set  $A_{U(0)}$  in the following way. Put  $i_1$  is the smallest non-negative integer such that there exists  $j \in N$  with  $G_{i_1, j} \not\subseteq U(0)$  and  $j_1 = \max\{j: G_{i_1, j} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$ . Our assumption and Lemma 3.8 imply that so ordered pair  $(i_1, j_1)$  there exists in  $A_{U(0)}$ .

Suppose that for some positive integer  $k$  we determined the finite sequence  $\{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k)\}$  of ordered pairs in the set  $A_{U(0)}$ . We shall define an ordered pair  $(i_{k+1}, j_{k+1}) \in A_{U(0)}$  in the following way. Put  $i_{k+1}$  is the smallest non-negative integer greater  $i_k$  such that there exists  $j \in N$  such that  $G_{i_{k+1}, j} \not\subseteq U(0)$  and  $j_{k+1} = \max\{j: G_{i_{k+1}, j} \not\subseteq U(0)\}$ . Our assumption and Lemma 3.8 imply that so ordered pair  $(i_{k+1}, j_{k+1})$  there exists in  $A_{U(0)}$ .

Now, by separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^0)$  such that  $V(0) \cdot (1, 1_G, 0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Then the semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  implies that for any element  $(i_n, j_n)$  of the infinite sequence  $\{(i_n, j_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  the following conditions hold:

$$[V(0)]_{i_n, j_n+1} \subseteq [U(0)]_{i_n, j_n} \neq G_{i_n, j_n} \quad \text{and} \quad [U(0)]_{i_n, j_n+1} = G_{i_n, j_n+1}.$$

By Lemma 3.1 the family  $\mathcal{V} = \{\{V(0)\}, \{G_{i,j}: i, j \in N\}\}$  is an open cover of the compact set  $\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))$ . Then above arguments imply that the cover  $\mathcal{V}$  has no a finite subcover, which contradicts the compactness of  $\text{cl}_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0}(U(0))$ . The obtained contradiction implies the statement of the lemma.  $\square$

**Example 3.10.** Let  $(G, \tau_G)$  be a Hausdorff semitopological group,  $\theta: G \rightarrow G$  be a continuous homomorphism and  $\mathcal{B}_G(g)$  be a base of the topology  $\tau_G$  at a point  $g \in G$ .

On the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  we define a topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\oplus}$  in the following way:

(i) at any non-zero element  $(i, g, j) \in G_{i,j}$  of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  the family

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{B}}^{\oplus}(i, g, j) = \{U_{i,j}: U \in \mathcal{B}_G(g)\}$$

determines a base of the topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\oplus}$  at the point  $(i, g, j) \in \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$ ;

(ii) zero  $0 \in \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\oplus})$ .

Simple verifications show that the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\oplus})$  is separate continuous.

We extend the construction proposed in Example 3.4 onto compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with a compact maximal subgroup in Example 3.11.

**Example 3.11.** Let  $(G, \tau_G)$  be a compact Hausdorff topological group,  $\theta: G \rightarrow G$  be a continuous homomorphism and  $\mathcal{B}_G(g)$  be a base of the topology  $\tau_G$  at a point  $g \in G$ .

On the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  we define a topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{Ac}}$  in the following way:

(i) at any non-zero element  $(i, g, j) \in G_{i,j}$  of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  the family

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{Ac}}(i, g, j) = \{U_{i,j}: U \in \mathcal{B}_G(g)\}$$

determines a base of the topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{Ac}}$  at the point  $(i, g, j) \in \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$ ;

(ii) the family  $\mathcal{B}(0) = \{U_{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k)}: (i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k) \in N \times N\}$ , where

$$U_{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k)} = \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0 \setminus \{G_{i_1, j_1} \cup \dots \cup G_{i_k, j_k}\},$$

determines a base of the topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{Ac}}$  at zero  $0 \in \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$ ,

i.e.,  $\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{Ac}}$  is the topology of the Alexandroff one-point compactification of the locally compact space  $\bigoplus \{G_{i,j}: i, j \in N\}$ , where for any  $i, j \in N$  the space  $G_{i,j}$  is homeomorphic to the compact group  $(G, \tau_G)$  under the map  $(i, g, j) \mapsto g$ , with the remainder  $\{0\}$ . Simple routine verifications show that the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{Ac}})$  is separate continuous.

Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 3.8 imply the following dichotomy for Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroups with a compact maximal subgroup:

**Theorem 3.12.** *Let  $S$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with a compact maximal subgroups  $G$  distinct from zero. Then  $S$  is topologically isomorphic either to  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_B^\oplus)$  or to  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_B^{\text{Ac}})$ , for some continuous homomorphism  $\theta: G \rightarrow G$ .*

Since the bicyclic monoid  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  does not embed into any Hausdorff compact topological semigroup [2], Theorem 3.12 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.13.** *If  $S$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topological 0-bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with a compact maximal subgroup  $G$  distinct from zero, then  $S$  is topologically isomorphic to  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_B^\oplus)$ , for some continuous homomorphism  $\theta: G \rightarrow G$ .*

Later we need the following trivial lemma, which follows from the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in semitopological semigroups.

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let  $S$  be a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup and  $I$  be a compact ideal in  $S$ . Then the Rees-quotient semigroup  $S/I$  with the quotient topology is a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup.*

**Theorem 3.15.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with a compact group of units  $G$  and an adjoined compact ideal  $I$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I = \mathbf{B}(G, \theta) \sqcup I$ . Then either  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$  is a compact semitopological semigroup or the ideal  $I$  is open.*

*Proof.* Suppose that the ideal  $I$  is not open. By Lemma 3.1 the Rees-quotient semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$  with the quotient topology  $\tau_q$  is a semitopological semigroup. Let  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$  be the natural homomorphism which is a quotient map. It is obvious that the Rees-quotient semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$  is isomorphic to the Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$  and the image  $\pi(I)$  is zero  $0$  of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0$ . Now we shall show that the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$  is a hereditarily quotient map.

We shall show that for every open neighbourhood  $U(I)$  of the ideal  $I$  in the space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$  the image  $\pi(U(I))$  is an open neighbourhood of the zero  $0$  in the space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I, \tau_q)$ . Indeed,  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \setminus U(I)$  is a closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$ . Also, since the restriction  $\pi|_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)}: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta) \rightarrow \pi(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta))$  of the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$  is one-to-one,  $\pi(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \setminus U(I))$  is a closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I, \tau_q)$ . So  $\pi(U(I))$  is an open neighbourhood of the zero  $0$  of the semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I, \tau_q)$ , and hence the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$  is a hereditarily quotient map. Since  $I$  is a compact ideal of the semitopological semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$ ,  $\pi^{-1}(y)$  is a compact subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$  for every  $y \in \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$ . By Din' N'e T'ong's Theorem (see [14] or [17, 3.7.E]),  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I, \tau_q)$  is a Hausdorff locally compact space. If  $I$  is not open then by Theorem 3.12 the semitopological semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I, \tau_q)$  is topologically isomorphic to  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^0, \tau_B^{\text{Ac}})$  and hence it is compact.

Next we shall prove that the space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$  is compact. Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha: \alpha \in \mathcal{J}\}$  be an arbitrary open cover of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$ . Since  $I$  is compact, there exist  $U_{\alpha_1}, \dots, U_{\alpha_n} \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $I \subseteq U_{\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup U_{\alpha_n}$ . Put  $U = U_{\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup U_{\alpha_n}$ . Then  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \setminus U$  is a closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$ . Also, since the restriction  $\pi|_{\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)}: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta) \rightarrow \pi(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta))$  of the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I$  is one-to-one,  $\pi(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \setminus U)$  is a closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I, \tau_q)$ , and hence the image  $\pi(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \setminus U)$  is compact, because the semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I/I, \tau_q)$  is compact. Thus, the set  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I \setminus U$  is compact and hence the space  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$  is compact as well.  $\square$

Since every Bruck–Reilly extension contains the bicyclic monoid  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$  and compact topological semigroup does not contain the semigroup  $\mathcal{C}(p, q)$ , Theorem 3.15 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.16.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topological bisimple inverse  $\omega$ -semigroup with a compact group of units  $G$  and an adjoined compact ideal  $I$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I = \mathbf{B}(G, \theta) \sqcup I$ . Then the ideal  $I$  is open in  $(\mathbf{B}(G, \theta)^I, \tau)$ .*

#### 4. ON LOCALLY COMPACT SEMITOPOLOGICAL 0-BISIMPLE INVERSE $\omega$ -SEMIGROUPS WHICH CONTAIN THE ADDITIVE GROUP OF INTEGERS AS A MAXIMAL SUBGROUP

The structure of a locally compact topological group with adjoined non-isolated zero was described by Hofmann in Theorem I of [31]. In the case of a semitopological semigroup we have more difficult situation with the respect to the above Hofmann's results and in this section we consider more a simple group: the additive group of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ .

Later by  $\mathbb{Z}_+^0$  we shall denote the additive group of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  with adjoined zero 0 which is a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup and by  $0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  the identity of  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Remark 4.1.** If the space  $\mathbb{Z}_+^0$  is locally compact then by Theorem 3.3.8 from [17] the subspace  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is locally compact. Then by the Baire Category Theorem (see [17, Theorem 3.9.3]) the space  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  has an isolated point, and since translation in  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  are homeomorphisms we get that  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is a discrete subspace of  $\mathbb{Z}_+^0$ .

We need the following technical lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological additive semigroup of positive integers with an adjoined zero 0. Then  $\mathbb{N}$  is a discrete subspace of  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  and the space  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  is either compact or discrete.*

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  is locally compact Theorem 3.3.8 of [17] implies  $\mathbb{N}$  is locally compact too. Now Hausdorffness of the space  $\mathbb{N}$  implies that the set  $[n+1) = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, \dots, n\}$  is open in  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$ , and hence by Theorem 3.3.8 from [17] it is locally compact. By the Baire Category Theorem the space  $[n+1)$  contains an isolated point  $m$ . It is obvious that  $m$  is isolated in  $\mathbb{N}$ . Since  $n < m$  the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  implies that  $n$  is an isolated point of  $\mathbb{N}$ , and hence by Hausdorffness of  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  the point  $n$  is isolated in  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$ .

Suppose that there exists a Hausdorff locally compact non-compact topology  $\tau$  on  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  such that  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  is a semitopological semigroup and zero 0 is not isolated point in  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$ . Fix an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero 0 in  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$ . Since  $\mathbb{N}$  is a discrete subspace of  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  without loss of generality we may assume that  $U(0)$  is compact. Since the space  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  is not compact and  $\mathbb{N}$  is a discrete subspace of  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  there exists an infinite increasing sequence of positive integers  $\{n_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  such that  $U(0) = \mathbb{N}_+^0 \setminus \{n_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero 0 in  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$  such that  $1 + V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Now, by the existence of the sequence  $\{n_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  we have that the family  $\mathcal{V} = \{V(0), \{V(n_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}\}$  is an open cover of  $U(0)$  which does not contain a finite subcover. This contradicts the compactness of  $U(0)$ . The obtained contradiction implies the second statement of the lemma.  $\square$

We need the following technical lemma.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $S$  be a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup and  $M$  be a dense subsemigroup of  $S$ . If  $1_M$  and  $0_M$  are identity and zero in  $M$ , respectively, then  $1_M$  and  $0_M$  so are in  $S$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose to contrary that  $1_M$  is not the identity of  $S$ . Then there exists  $x \in S$  such that at least one of the following cases holds:

$$(a) \ x \cdot 1_M = y \neq x; \quad (b) \ 1_M \cdot x = z \neq x.$$

Assume that case (a) holds. By Hausdorffness of  $S$  there exist disjoint open neighbourhoods  $U(x)$  and  $U(y)$  of the points  $x$  and  $y$  in  $S$ , respectively. Since  $S$  is a semitopological semigroup there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(x) \subseteq U(x)$  such that  $V(x) \cdot 1_M \subseteq U(y)$ . But  $M$  is a dense subsemigroup of  $S$  and hence we have that  $V(x) \cap M \neq \emptyset$  which implies that  $V(x) \cdot 1_M \cap U(x) \neq \emptyset$ . This contradicts the Hausdorffness of  $S$  and obtained contradiction implies the equality  $x \cdot 1_M = x$  for all  $x \in S$ . The proof of the equality  $1_M \cdot x = x$ , for  $x \in S$ , is similar and hence  $1_M$  is identity of  $S$ .

The proof the fact that  $0_M$  is zero of  $S$  is similar of the above arguments.  $\square$

Since the subset  $\mathbb{N}_+^0 = \{0\} \cup \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : -n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}_+^0$  is a subsemigroup which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{N}_+^0$ , Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 and Remark 4.1 imply the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbb{Z}_+^0$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup. Then all non-zero elements of  $\mathbb{Z}_+^0$  are isolated points in  $(\mathbb{Z}_+^0, \tau)$  and only one the following conditions holds:*

- (i) zero 0 is isolated in  $(\mathbb{Z}_+^0, \tau)$ ;
- (ii) the family  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{cf}} = \{U_F = \mathbb{Z}_+^0 \setminus F : F \text{ is a finite subset of } \mathbb{Z}\}$  is a base of  $\tau$  at zero;
- (iii) the family  $\mathcal{B}^+ = \{U_F^+ = \mathbb{N}_+^0 \setminus F : F \text{ is a finite subset of } \mathbb{N}\}$  is a base of  $\tau$  at zero;
- (iv) the family  $\mathcal{B}^- = \{U_F^- = \mathbb{Z}_+^0 \setminus (\mathbb{N} \cup F) : F \text{ is a finite subset of } \mathbb{Z}\}$  is a base of  $\tau$  at zero.

Next we define four topologies  $\tau_{\mathbf{d}}$ ,  $\tau_{\mathbf{cf}}$ ,  $\tau_+$  and  $\tau_-$  on the Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ , where  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+ : z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  is the annihilating homomorphism.

**Example 4.5.** Put  $\tau_{\mathbf{d}}$  is the discrete topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ . It is obvious that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{d}})$  is a topological inverse semigroup.

**Example 4.6.** We define a topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{cf}}$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  in the following way. Put  $(i, g, j)$  is an isolated point of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{cf}})$  in the following cases:

- (1)  $g \neq 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (2)  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $i$  or  $j$  is equal to the null 0,

and the family

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{cf}}(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j) = \left\{ (U_F)_{i,j}^0 = (\mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus F)_{i,j}^0 : F \text{ is a finite subset of } \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

determines the base of the topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{cf}}$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  at the point  $(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)$ , for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Simple verifications show that  $\tau_{\mathbf{cf}}$  is a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ .

Next we shall prove the fact that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{cf}})$  is a semitopological inverse semigroup with continuous inversion. Now, the definition of the topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{cf}}$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that it is sufficient to show that the semigroup operation on  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{cf}})$  is separate continuous in the following two cases:

$$(U_F)_{i,j}^0 \cdot (m, g, n) \quad \text{and} \quad (m, g, n) \cdot (U_F)_{i,j}^0,$$

where  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $F$  is an arbitrary finite subset of  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $g$  is an arbitrary element of the group  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ .

Elementary calculations show that

$$(U_F)_{i,j}^0 \cdot (m, g, n) = \begin{cases} \{(m + i - j, g, n)\}, & \text{if } j < m; \\ (U_{F+g})_{i,n}^0, & \text{if } j = m; \\ (U_F)_{i,j+n-m}^0, & \text{if } j > m, \end{cases}$$

$$(i, g, j) \cdot (U_F)_{m,n}^0 = \begin{cases} (U_F)_{i+m-j,n}^0, & \text{if } j < m; \\ (U_{g+F})_{i,n}^0, & \text{if } j = m; \\ \{(i, g, j + n - m)\}, & \text{if } j > m, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\text{inv} \left( (U_F)_{i,j}^0 \right) = (U_{-F})_{j,i}^0,$$

where  $g + F = F + g = \{f + g : f \in F\}$  and  $-F = \{-f : f \in F\}$ . This completes the proof the fact that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_{\mathbf{cf}})$  is a semitopological inverse semigroup with continuous inversion.

**Example 4.7.** We define a topology  $\tau_+$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  in the following way. Put  $(i, g, j)$  is an isolated point of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_+)$  in the following cases:

- (1)  $g \neq 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (2)  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $i$  or  $j$  is equal to the null 0,

and the family

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{B}_+(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j) = \left\{ (U_F^+)_{i,j}^0 = (\mathbb{N} \setminus F)_{i,j}^0 : F \text{ is a finite subset of } \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

determines the base of the topology  $\tau_+$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  at the point  $(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)$ , for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Simple verifications show that  $\tau_+$  is a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ .

Next we shall prove the fact that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_+)$  is a topological semigroup. Now, the definition of the topology  $\tau_{\mathbf{cf}}$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that it is sufficient to show that the semigroup operation on  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_+)$  is continuous in the following three cases:

$$(U_F^+)_{i,j}^0 \cdot (m, g, n), \quad (m, g, n) \cdot (U_F^+)_{i,j}^0, \quad \text{and} \quad (U_F^+)_{k,l}^0 \cdot (U_{F'}^+)_{i,j}^0,$$

where  $i, j, k, l \in N$ ,  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $F$  and  $F'$  are arbitrary finite subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $g$  is an arbitrary element of the group  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ .

Later without loss of generality we may assume that in formula (1) the set  $F$  is an initial interval of the set of positive integers.

Elementary calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( U_{\overline{F-g}}^+ \right)_{i,j}^0 \cdot (m, g, n) &= \begin{cases} \{(m+i-j, g, n)\}, & \text{if } j < m; \\ (U_F^+)_{i,n}^0, & \text{if } j = m; \\ \left( U_{\overline{F-g}}^+ \right)_{i,j+n-m}^0, & \text{if } j > m, \end{cases} \\ (i, g, j) \cdot \left( U_{\overline{F-g}}^+ \right)_{m,n}^0 &= \begin{cases} \left( U_{\overline{F-g}}^+ \right)_{i+m-j,n}^0, & \text{if } j < m; \\ (U_F^+)_{i,n}^0, & \text{if } j = m; \\ \{(i, g, j+n-m)\}, & \text{if } j > m, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(U_F^+)_{i,j}^0 \cdot (U_F^+)_{m,n}^0 = \begin{cases} (U_F^+)_{m,n}^0, & \text{if } j < m; \\ (U_{2F}^+)_{i,n}^0, & \text{if } j = m; \\ (U_F^+)_{i,j}^0, & \text{if } j > m, \end{cases}$$

where  $U_{F-g} = \{f - g : f \in F\}$ ,  $\overline{U_{F-g}} = \mathbb{N} \cap U_{F-g}$  and  $U_{2F} = \{f + g : f, g \in F\}$ . This completes the proof the fact that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_+)$  is a topological semigroup.

**Example 4.8.** We define a topology  $\tau_-$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  in the following way. Put  $(i, g, j)$  is an isolated point of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_-)$  in the following cases:

- (1)  $g \neq 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  and  $i, j \in N$ ;
- (2)  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $i$  or  $j$  is equal to the null 0,

and the family

$$\mathcal{B}_-(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j) = \left\{ (U_F^-)_{i,j}^0 = (\mathbb{Z} \setminus (N \cup F))_{i,j}^0 : F \text{ is a finite subset of } \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

determines the base of the topology  $\tau_-$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  at the point  $(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)$ , for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Simple verifications show that  $\tau_-$  is a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ .

We observe that the map  $\Phi: (\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_+) \rightarrow (\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_-)$  defined by the formula  $\Phi(i, g, j) = (i, -g, j)$  is an algebraic automorphism of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  which is a homeomorphism of topological spaces  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_+)$  and  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_-)$ , and hence  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_-)$  is a topological semigroup which is topologically isomorphic to the topological semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau_+)$ .

The following theorem describes all Hausdorff locally compact topologies on the Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  in the case when  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  is the annihilating homomorphism such that  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a semitopological semigroup.

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup. Then only one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i)  $\tau$  is discrete;
- (ii)  $\tau = \tau_{\mathbf{cf}}$ ;

- (iii)  $\tau = \tau_+$ ;
- (iv)  $\tau = \tau_-$ .

*Proof.* The semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that

$$(i, g, j)(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) = \begin{cases} (i+1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1), & \text{if } j = 0; \\ (i, g, 1), & \text{if } j = 1; \\ (i, g, j), & \text{if } j > 1, \end{cases}$$

for arbitrary  $i, j \in N$ , and since the right shift  $\rho_{(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1)}: (\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau) \rightarrow (\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau): x \mapsto x \cdot (1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1)$  is continuous, the subspace  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,0}^0$  of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is closed, and hence the local compactness of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  and Theorem 3.3.8 from [17] imply that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,0}^0$  is locally compact. Now, again by the definition of the semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  we have that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,0}^0$  is (algebraically) isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_+^0$ , and hence the statement of Proposition 4.4 holds. Then by Proposition 2.4(iv) the subspace  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j}^0$  of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is locally compact for all  $i, j \in N$ . Also the local compactness of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  implies that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j}$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  for all  $i, j \in N$ , and hence by Proposition 2.4(viii) the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  we obtain that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j}^0$  is an open subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  for all  $i, j \in N$ . Now, Proposition 2.4(iv) and Proposition 4.4 completes the proof of our theorem.  $\square$

The following corollary follows from Theorem 4.9 and it describes all semigroup Hausdorff locally compact topologies on the Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  in the case when  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  is the annihilating homomorphism.

**Corollary 4.10.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup. Then only one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i)  $\tau$  is discrete;
- (ii)  $\tau = \tau_+$ ;
- (iii)  $\tau = \tau_-$ .

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is discrete. Then  $\tau$  is discrete, too.*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that there exists a non-discrete Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is discrete, i.e., zero of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  is non-isolated point of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .

Since all non-zero elements of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  are isolated points in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  we have that  $\eta^\sharp$  is a closed congruence on  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . Next we shall show that if the natural homomorphism  $\eta: \mathbf{BR}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is a quotient map then  $\eta$  is open. Since all non-zero elements in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  are isolated points it sufficient to prove that the image  $\eta(U_0)$  is an open subset of the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  for every open neighbourhood  $U_0$  of zero. Put  $U_0^* = \eta^{-1}(\eta(U_0))$ . Since  $\eta: \mathbf{BR}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is a natural homomorphism we have that  $U_0^* = \eta^{-1}(\eta(U_0^*))$  and

$$U_0^* = \bigcup \{(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j}: (\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j} \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \cup U_0.$$

The last equality and Lemma 3.1 implies that  $U_0^*$  is an open subset of the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . Since  $\eta: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is a quotient map and  $U_0^* = \eta^{-1}(\eta(U_0^*))$ , we conclude that  $\eta(U_0)$  is an open subset of the space  $\mathcal{C}^0$ . This implies that the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 / \eta^\sharp$  with the quotient topology is a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup.

By Theorem 3.3.15 from [17],  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 / \eta^\sharp$  with the quotient topology is a locally compact space with non-isolated zero. Then by Theorem 1 from [22] the quotient semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 / \eta^\sharp$  with the quotient topology is topologically isomorphic to the compact semitopological semigroup  $(\mathcal{C}^0, \tau_{\text{Ac}})$  (see

Example 3.4). Now, since the natural homomorphism  $\eta: (\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}^0, \tau_{\text{Ac}})$  is an open map, for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exist finitely many subsets  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j}$  in  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j} \cap U(0) = \emptyset$ .

Next we shall show that for any open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exist finitely many subsets  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j}$  in  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$ ,  $j \in N$ , such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j} \not\subseteq U(0)$ . Suppose to the contrary that there exist an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and infinitely many subsets  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j}$  in  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$ ,  $j \in N$ , such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j} \not\subseteq U(0)$ . Since  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete subspace of the locally compact space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  is compact. Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  such that  $(0, 1, 0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Also, the assumption that there exist infinitely many subsets  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j}$  in  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$ ,  $j \in N$ , such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j} \not\subseteq U(0)$  implies that the following open cover  $\mathcal{V} = \{\{V(0)\}, \{(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j} : i, j \in N\}\}$  of the set  $U(0)$  does not contain a finite subcover. This contradicts the compactness of  $U(0)$ . The obtained contradiction implies our above assumption.

Fix an arbitrary compact open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and a set  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j_0}$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j_0} \subseteq U(0)$ . Then the following formula

$$(i, g, j)(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) = \begin{cases} (i+1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1), & \text{if } j = 0; \\ (i, g, 1), & \text{if } j = 1; \\ (i, g, j), & \text{if } j > 1, \end{cases}$$

$i, j \in N$ , implies that the set  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j_0}^0$  is open-and-closed in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  because  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . Then the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  contains the open-and-closed discrete subspace  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j_0}$  which contradicts the compactness of  $U(0)$ . The obtained contradiction implies the statement of the proposition.  $\square$

For all non-negative integers  $k$  and  $l$  we put  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{k,l}^0 = (\mathbb{Z}_+)_{k,l}^0 \setminus \{(k, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, l)\}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}} = \{(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i,j}^0 : i, j \in N\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}} = \{\{(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)\} : ij = 0 \text{ and } i, j \in N\}$ . It is obvious that  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta) = \bigcup \tilde{\mathfrak{Z}} \cup \bigcup \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}$ .

The following proposition presents “step-by-step” the proof of Theorem 4.13.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+ : z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup with non-isolated zero  $0$  and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  coincides with the topology  $\tau_{\text{cf}}$ . Then the following assertions hold:*

- (i) *for any non-negative integers  $i$  and  $j$  the set  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i,j}^0$  is open-and-closed in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and hence is compact;*
- (ii) *every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$ ;*
- (iii) *for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$  of the form  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i_0,j}^0$ ;*
- (iv) *for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$  of the form  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{j,i_0}^0$ ;*
- (v) *for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  and every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  the family  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0} = \{(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i_0,j}^0 \in \tilde{\mathfrak{Z}} : (\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i_0,j}^0 \cap U(0) = \emptyset\}$  is finite;*
- (vi) *for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  and every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  the family  $\mathfrak{V}_{i_0} = \{(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{j,i_0}^0 \in \tilde{\mathfrak{Z}} : (\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{j,i_0}^0 \cap U(0) = \emptyset\}$  is finite;*
- (vii) *for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  the set  $\{(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j) : j \in N\} \setminus U(0)$  is finite;*
- (viii) *for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  the set  $\{(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) : i \in N\} \setminus U(0)$  is finite;*

- (ix) for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  and every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exist finitely many subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i_0, j}^0$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i_0, j}^0 \not\subseteq U(0)$ ;
- (x) for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  and every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exist finitely many subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{j, i_0}^0$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{j, i_0}^0 \not\subseteq U(0)$ ;
- (xi) for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exist finitely many subsets  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i_1, j_1}^0, \dots, (\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i_k, j_k}^0$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i_1, j_1}^0 \cup \dots \cup (\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i_k, j_k}^0 \cup U(0) = \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$ .

*Proof.* Statement (i) follows from the definition of the topology  $\tau_{\text{cf}}$  on the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ .

(ii) Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  which intersects finitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$ . Now the definition of the topology  $\tau_{\text{cf}}$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that the set  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i, j}^0$  is compact for all non-negative integers  $i$  and  $j$ , and hence without loss of generality we may assume that  $U(0) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \bigcup \tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$ . Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot V(0) \cup V(0) \cdot (1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \subseteq U(0)$ . By the semigroup operation in  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  we get that

$$(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot (0, x, i) = (1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1 + i) \quad \text{and} \quad (i, x, 0) \cdot (1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) = (i + 1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1),$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and any non-negative integer  $i$ , which contradicts the above inclusions. The obtained contradiction implies that our assumption holds.

(iii) First we shall show that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that  $U(0)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$  of the form  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i_0, j}^0$ . Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $U(0)$  intersects finitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$  of the form  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i_0, j}^0$  for each non-negative integer  $i_0$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  of  $U(0)$  is a compact set. Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $V(0) \cdot (0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that the family  $\mathcal{U} = \left\{ V(0), \left\{ (\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i, j}^0 : i, j \in N \right\} \right\}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  which does not contain a finite subcover. The obtained contradiction implies the requested statement.

Next we suppose that for an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $W(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that  $W(0)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$  of the form  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i_0, j}^0$ . We shall prove that for an arbitrary non-negative integer  $k$  the neighbourhood  $W(0)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the family  $\tilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$  of the form  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{k, j}^0$ . The separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq W(0)$  and  $(k, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, i_0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq W(0)$ , and hence our assertion holds.

The proof of statement (iv) is similar to (iii).

(v) Suppose to the contrary that there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  the family  $\mathfrak{H}_{i_0}$  is infinite. Without loss of generality we may assume that the closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  of  $U(0)$  is a compact set. Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that the family  $\mathcal{U} = \left\{ V(0), \left\{ (\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)_{i, j}^0 : i, j \in N \right\} \right\}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . But the semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  implies that the cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  does not contain a finite subcover, a contradiction. The obtained contradiction implies the requested statement.

The proof of statement (vi) is similar to (v).

(vii) Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that the set  $\{(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j) : j \in N\} \setminus U(0)$  is infinite. Without loss of generality we may assume that the closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  of  $U(0)$  is a compact set. Since for any non-negative integer  $j$  the subspace  $(\mathbb{Z})_{0, j}$  is open and discrete in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  our above assumption implies that the set

$\{(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j) : j \in N\} \setminus \text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  is infinite too. By item (i) for every non-negative integer  $j$  the set  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)^0_{0,j}$  is compact and hence the discreteness of  $(\mathbb{Z})_{0,j}$  implies that  $(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)^0_{0,j} \cap U(0)$  is compact, too. Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(0, 1_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ , where  $1_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  is a generator of the additive group of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ . It is obvious that the family  $\mathcal{U} = \left\{ V(0), \left\{ (\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)^0_{i,j} : i, j \in N \right\} \right\} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . But the semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  implies that the cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  does not contain a finite subcover, a contradiction. The obtained contradiction completes the proof of the requested statement.

The proof of statement (viii) is similar to (vii).

(ix) Suppose to the contrary that there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and there exist infinitely many subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)^0_{i_0,j}$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)^0_{i_0,j} \not\subseteq U(0)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  of  $U(0)$  is a compact set. Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(i_0, 1_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, i_0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ , where  $1_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  is a generator of the additive group of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ . It is obvious that the family  $\mathcal{U} = \left\{ V(0), \left\{ (\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)^0_{i,j} : i, j \in N \right\} \right\}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . But the semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  implies that the cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  does not contain a finite subcover, a contradiction. The obtained contradiction implies the requested statement.

The proof of statement (x) is similar to (ix).

(xi) Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)^0_{i_1,j_1} \cup \dots \cup (\mathbb{Z}_+)^0_{i_k,j_k} \cup U(0) \neq \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  for any finite family  $\{(\mathbb{Z}_+)^0_{i_1,j_1}, \dots, (\mathbb{Z}_+)^0_{i_k,j_k}\}$ . This and statements (x) and (ix) imply that there exists an infinite sequence  $\{(i_n, g_n, j_n) \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  in  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 \setminus U(0)$  such that  $g_n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and the sequences  $\{i_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $\{j_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  are increasing in  $N$ .

Without loss of generality we may assume that the closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  of  $U(0)$  is a compact set. Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot V(0) \cup V(0) \cdot (1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that the family  $\mathcal{U} = \left\{ V(0), \left\{ (\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_+)^0_{i,j} : i, j \in N \right\} \right\}$  is an open cover of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . But the semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  implies that the cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  does not contain a finite subcover, a contradiction. The obtained contradiction completes the proof of the requested statement.  $\square$

Proposition 4.12 implies the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.13.** *Let  $\theta : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+ : z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  coincides with the topology  $\tau_{\text{cf}}$ . Then either  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is compact or zero is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .*

For all non-negative integers  $k$  and  $l$  we put  $(-\mathbb{N})_{k,l} = \{(k, -n, l) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $\mathfrak{N}^+ = \{\mathbb{N}_{i,j}^0 : i, j \in N\}$  and  $\mathfrak{N}^- = \{(-\mathbb{N})_{i,j} : i, j \in N\}$ .

**Proposition 4.14.** *Let  $\theta : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+ : z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup with non-isolated zero 0 and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  coincides with  $\tau_+$ . Then the following assertions hold:*

- (i) *for any non-negative integers  $i$  and  $j$  the set  $\mathbb{N}_{i,j}^0$  is open-and-closed in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and hence is compact;*
- (ii) *every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the family  $\mathfrak{N}^+$ ;*

- (iii) for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects almost all elements of the family  $\mathfrak{N}^+$  of the form  $\mathbb{N}_{i_0, j}^0$ ;
- (iv) every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  contains almost all elements of the form  $(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)$ ,  $j \in N$ ;
- (v) every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  contains almost all subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_0^0, j \in N$ .

*Proof.* Statement (i) follows from the definition of the topology  $\tau_+$  on the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ .

(ii) Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  which intersects finitely many elements of the family  $\mathfrak{N}^+$ . Now the definition of the topology  $\tau_+$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that the set  $\mathbb{N}_{i, j}^0$  is compact for all non-negative integers  $i$  and  $j$ , and hence without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  and  $U(0) \cap \bigcup \mathfrak{N}^+ = \emptyset$ . Since  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  is the annihilating homomorphism item (i) implies that  $(-\mathbb{N})_{k, l} = (\mathbb{Z}_+)_0^0 \setminus \mathbb{N}_{k, l}^0$  is a closed discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  for all  $k, l \in N$ . This implies that the set  $U(0) \cap (-\mathbb{N})_{k, l}$  is finite for all  $k, l \in N$ . By the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  we have that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $V(0) \cdot (1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Then  $U(0) \setminus V(0)$  is an infinite subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  and the definition of the topology  $\tau_+$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that the set  $U(0) \setminus V(0)$  does not have an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ , which contradicts the compactness of the space  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . The obtained contradiction implies our assertion.

(iii) First we shall show that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that  $U(0)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the form  $\mathbb{N}_{i_0, j}^0$ . If we assume to the contrary then by item (ii) there exists an increasing sequence  $\{i_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of positive integers such that  $\mathbb{N}_{i_n, j_n}^0 \cap U(0) \neq \emptyset$  for some sequence of non-negative integers  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then for every element  $i_p$  of the sequence  $\{i_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  there exists there exists a maximum non-negative integer  $j_{i_p}$  such that  $\mathbb{N}_{i_p, j_{i_p}}^0 \cap U(0) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{N}_{i_p, j_{i_p} + k}^0 \cap U(0) = \emptyset$  for any positive integer  $k$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . By the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  we have that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $V(0) \cdot (0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that our above arguments imply that there exists a sequence of distinct points  $\{(i_n, z_n, j_{i_n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq U(0) \setminus V(0)$  which is a subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then the definition of the topology  $\tau_+$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that this sequence has no an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  which contradicts the compactness of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ .

By the above part of the proof we have that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{N}_{i_0, j}^0 \neq \emptyset$  for infinitely many elements of the family  $\mathfrak{N}^+$  of the form  $\mathbb{N}_{i_0, j}^0$ . Since the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is separate continuous, for any non-negative integer  $i$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, i_0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . The last inclusion implies that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and any non-negative integer  $i$  we have that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{N}_{i, j}^0 \neq \emptyset$  for infinitely many elements of the family  $\mathfrak{N}^+$  of the form  $\mathbb{N}_{i, j}^0$ . Hence we get that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{N}_{0, j}^0 \neq \emptyset$  for infinitely many elements of the family  $\mathfrak{N}^+$  of the form  $\mathbb{N}_{0, j}^0$ .

Suppose that there exists an infinite increasing sequence  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{N}_{0, j_n}^0 = \emptyset$  for any elements  $j_n$  of  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the sequence  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is maximal, i.e.,  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{N}_{0, j}^0 \neq \emptyset$  for any non-negative integer  $j \notin \{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $\{j_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{N}_{0, j_{n_k}}^0 = \emptyset$  and  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{N}_{0, j_{n_k} + 1}^0 \neq \emptyset$ . Now, the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that our above arguments imply that there exists a sequence of distinct points  $\{(0, z_{n_k}, j_{n_k})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq U(0) \setminus V(0)$  which is a subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then the definition of the topology  $\tau_+$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that this sequences has no an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  which contradicts the compactness

of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Hence we have that every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects almost all elements of the form  $\mathbb{N}_{0,j}^0$ . Again, since the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is separate continuous, for any non-negative integer  $i$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $W(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, i_0) \cdot W(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . The last inclusion implies our assertion.

(iv) Fix an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . Then by item (iii) we have that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  intersects almost all elements of the family  $\mathfrak{N}^+$  of the form  $\mathbb{N}_{0,j}^0$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . By the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Since  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot (0, z, k) = (0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, k)$  the inclusion  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  implies our assertion.

(v) Fix an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Now, the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that for every element  $k$  of the additive group of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V_k(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V_k(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(0, k, 0) \cdot V_k(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Then by item (iv) we have that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  contains almost all elements of the form  $(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)$  and hence the above arguments implies our statement.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.15.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  coincides with the topology  $\tau_+$ . Then zero  $0$  of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .*

*Proof.* First we observe that Example 4.7 and Proposition 4.14 imply that for all non-negative integers  $i$  and  $j$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  the point  $(i, n, j)$  is isolated in  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j}^0$ . Then the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that the set  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j}^0$  is open-and-closed in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  for any non-negative integer  $j$ .

Now, fix an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  with the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then by Proposition 4.14(v) there exists a positive integer  $j_0$  such that  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j_0}^0 \subseteq U(0)$  and hence  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j_0}^0$  is an open-and-closed subset of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . But  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j_0}^0$  is not compact, which contradicts the compactness of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . The obtained contradiction implies the statement of our theorem.  $\square$

Theorem 4.15 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.16.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a topological semigroup and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  coincides with the topology  $\tau_+$ . Then zero  $0$  of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .*

The proof of the following two statements are similar to Theorem 4.15 and Corollary 4.16, respectively.

**Theorem 4.17.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  coincides with the topology  $\tau_-$ . Then zero  $0$  of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .*

**Corollary 4.18.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+: z \mapsto 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Hausdorff locally compact topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a topological semigroup and the induced topology of  $\tau$  on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  coincides with the topology  $\tau_-$ . Then zero  $0$  of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .*

Later we need the following two folklore lemmas.

**Lemma 4.19.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be a homomorphism. Then the image  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)\theta$  is isomorphic to the additive group of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  if and only if  $\theta$  is non-annihilating.*

*Proof.* The implication  $(\Rightarrow)$  is trivial.

$(\Leftarrow)$  Suppose that a homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  is non-annihilating. Since the group  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is generated by the element 1 we have that  $(1)\theta = n \neq 0 \in (\mathbb{Z}_+)\theta \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$  for some integer  $n$ . This implies that the image  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)\theta$  is generated by the element  $n$  as a subgroup of  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ , and since  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is isomorphic to the free group over a singleton set,  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)\theta$  is isomorphic to the subgroup  $n\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{nk: k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ . It is obvious that  $n\mathbb{Z}_+$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.20.** *If  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  is an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism then for arbitrary positive integer  $i$  and an arbitrary  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  the equation  $(x)\theta^i = a$  has at most one solution.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(1)\theta = n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Since the homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  is non-annihilating, it is obvious that the equation  $(x)\theta^i = a$  has a unique solution if and only if  $a = n^i b$  for some integer  $b$ , and in the other case the equation  $(x)\theta^i = a$  hasn't a solution.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.21.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism. Then both equations  $\alpha \cdot \chi = \beta$  and  $\chi \cdot \gamma = \delta$  have finitely many solutions in  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ .*

*Proof.* We consider only the case of  $\alpha \cdot \chi = \beta$ . The proof in the other case is similar.

Put

$$\alpha = (n_1, z_1, m_1), \quad \beta = (n_2, z_2, m_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \chi = (n, z, m).$$

Then the semigroup operation of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  implies that

$$(n_2, z_2, m_2) = (n_1, z_1, m_1) \cdot (n, z, m) = \begin{cases} (n_1, z_1 + (z)\theta^{m_1-n}, m_1 - n + m), & \text{if } m_1 > n; \\ (n_1, z_1 + z, m), & \text{if } m_1 = n; \\ (n_1 - m_1 + n, (z_1)\theta^{n-m_1} + z, m), & \text{if } m_1 < n. \end{cases}$$

Then

- (1) in the case when  $m_1 < n$  we have that  $n = n_2 - n_1 + m_1$ ,  $m = m_2$  and  $z = z_2 - (z_1)\theta^{n-m_1}$ ;
- (2) in the case when  $m_1 = n$  we have that  $m = m_2$  and  $z = z_2 - z_1$ ;
- (3) in the case when  $m_1 > n$  we have that  $n_1 = n_2$ ,  $n - m = m_2 - m_1$  and  $(z)\theta^{m_1-n} = z_2 - z_1$ .

Now, the above three case and Lemma 4.20 imply the statement of the proposition.  $\square$

We recall that a topological space  $X$  is said to be a *Baire space* if for each sequence  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_i, \dots$  of nowhere dense subsets of  $X$  the union  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$  is a co-dense subset of  $X$  [29]. It is well known that every Čech-complete (and hence every locally compact) space is Baire (see [17, Section 3.9]).

The following theorem describes Baire  $T_1$ -semitopological semigroups  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  with a non-annihilating homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Theorem 4.22.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Baire  $T_1$ -topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup. Then  $\tau$  is discrete.*

*Proof.* Since the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is Baire and countable,  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  contains an isolated point  $(i_0, z_0, j_0)$ , where  $i_0$  and  $j_0$  are non-negative integers and  $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Fix an arbitrary element  $(i_1, z_1, j_1) \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ . Then we have that

$$(i_0, z_0 - z_1, i_1)(i_1, z_1, j_1)(j_1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j_0) = (i_0, z_0, j_0).$$

Proposition 4.21 implies that the equation

$$(i_0, z_0 - z_1, i_1) \cdot \chi \cdot (j_1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j_0) = (i_0, z_0, j_0)$$

has a finite non-empty set of solutions. Since  $\tau$  be a  $T_1$ -topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  implies that  $(i_1, z_1, j_1)$  is an isolated point in the topological space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$ . Hence the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is discrete.  $\square$

Theorem 4.22 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.23.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a locally compact  $T_1$ -topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta), \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup. Then  $\tau$  is discrete.*

Now we obtain the description of Baire  $T_1$ -semitopological semigroups  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  with a non-annihilating homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Theorem 4.24.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a Baire  $T_1$ -topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup. Then every non-zero element of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a Baire  $T_1$ -space,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is its open subspace, and hence by Proposition 1.14 from [29],  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is Baire too. Next we apply Theorem 4.22.  $\square$

Theorem 4.24 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.25.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $\tau$  be a locally compact  $T_1$ -topology on  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  such that  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is a semitopological semigroup. Then every non-zero element of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  is an isolated point in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ .*

**Proposition 4.26.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup with non-isolated zero 0. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (i) every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects infinitely many sets of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i,j}$ ,  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (ii) for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects almost all sets of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0,j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (iii) every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  contains almost all elements of the form  $(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (iv) every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  contains almost all subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0,j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (v) for any non-negative integer  $i_0$  every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  contains almost all subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i_0,j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (vi) for any non-negative integer  $j_0$  every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  contains almost all subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j_0}$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (vii) every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  contains almost all subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{i,j}$ ,  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (viii) for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  the set  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 \setminus U(0)$  is finite.

*Proof.* (i) Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  which intersects finitely many sets of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i,j}$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . By the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  we have that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $V(0) \cdot (1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Then  $U(0) \setminus V(0)$  is an infinite subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  and by Theorem 4.22,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . This implies that the set  $U(0) \setminus V(0)$  does not have an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ , which contradicts the compactness of the space  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . The obtained contradiction implies our assertion.

(ii) First we shall show that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that  $U(0)$  intersects infinitely many elements of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0,j}$ . If we assume to the contrary then by item (i) there exists an increasing sequence  $\{i_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of positive integers such that  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_n, j_n} \cap U(0) \neq \emptyset$  for some sequence of non-negative integers  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then for every element  $i_p$  of the sequence  $\{i_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  there exists a maximum non-negative integer  $j_{i_p}$  such that  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_p, j_{i_p}} \cap U(0) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_p, j_{i_p}+k} \cap U(0) = \emptyset$  for any positive integer  $k$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . By the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $V(0) \cdot (0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that our above arguments imply that there exists a sequence of distinct points  $\{(i_n, z_n, j_{i_n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq U(0) \setminus V(0)$  which is

a subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then by Theorem 4.22,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ , and hence this sequence has no an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  which contradicts the compactness of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ .

By the previous part of the proof we have that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  there exists a non-negative integer  $i_0$  such that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j} \neq \emptyset$  for infinitely many sets of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . Since the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is separate continuous, for any non-negative integer  $i$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, i_0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . The last inclusion implies that for every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and any non-negative integer  $i$  we have that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{i, j} \neq \emptyset$  for infinitely many sets of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence we get that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{0, j} \neq \emptyset$  for infinitely many sets of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Suppose that there exists an infinite increasing sequence  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of non-negative integers such that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{0, j_n} = \emptyset$  for any element  $j_n$  of  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the sequence  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is maximal, i.e.,  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{0, j} \neq \emptyset$  for any non-negative integer  $j \notin \{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $\{j_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\{j_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{0, j_{n_k}} = \emptyset$  and  $U(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{0, j_{n_k} + 1} \neq \emptyset$ . Now, the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that our above arguments imply that there exists a sequence of distinct points  $\{(0, z_{n_k}, j_{n_k})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq U(0) \setminus V(0)$  which is a subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then by Theorem 4.22,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and hence this sequence has no an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  which contradicts the compactness of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . This implies that every open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  intersects almost all of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Again, since the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is separate continuous, for any non-negative integer  $i$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $W(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(i, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, i_0) \cdot W(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . The last inclusion implies our assertion.

(iii) Fix an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . Then by item (ii) we have that the set  $U(0)$  intersects almost all sets of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . By the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Since  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot (0, z, k) = (0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, k)$  the inclusion  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 1) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  implies our assertion.

(iv) Fix an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Now, the separate continuity of the semigroup operation of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that for every element  $k$  of the additive group of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V_k(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $V_k(0) \subseteq U(0)$  and  $(0, k, 0) \cdot V_k(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Then by item (iii) we have that  $U(0)$  contains almost all elements of the form  $(0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, j)$  and hence the above arguments implies our statement.

(v) Fix an arbitrary open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$ . By item (iv) we have that  $U(0)$  contains almost all subsets of the form  $(\mathbb{Z}_+)_{0, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is separate continuous, for any non-negative integer  $i$  there exists an open neighbourhood  $V_i(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(i_0, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \cdot V_i(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . The last inclusion implies our assertion.

The proof of assertion (vi) is similar to (v).

(vii) If we assume to the contrary then by items (v) and (vi) there exists an increasing sequence  $\{(i_n, j_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of ordered pairs of positive integers such that  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_n, j_n} \cap U(0) = \emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_n, j_n + k} \cap U(0) = \emptyset$  for any positive integer  $k$ . Now, the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . It is obvious that our above arguments imply that there exists a sequence of distinct points  $\{(0, z_{n_k}, j_{n_k})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq U(0) \setminus V(0)$  which is a subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then by Theorem 4.22,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$

and hence this sequence does not have an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  which contradicts the compactness of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . The obtained contradiction implies our assertion.

(viii) Suppose to the contrary that there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that the set  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 \setminus U(0)$  is infinite. Without loss of generality we may assume that the neighbourhood  $U(0)$  has the compact closure  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then by assertion (vii) there exist non-negative integers  $i_0$  and  $j_0$  such that the set  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j_0} \setminus U(0)$  is infinite and the set  $\mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j_0+1} \setminus U(0)$  is finite. Now, the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  implies that there exists an open neighbourhood  $V(0) \subseteq U(0)$  of zero in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  such that  $(1, 0_{\mathbb{Z}_+}, 0) \cdot V(0) \subseteq U(0)$ . It is obvious that our above arguments imply that there exists a sequence of distinct points  $\{(i_0, z_n, j_0 + 1)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{i_0, j_0+1} \setminus V(0) \subseteq U(0) \setminus V(0)$  which is a subset of the compactum  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . Then by Theorem 4.22,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  and hence this sequence does not have an accumulation point in  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$  which contradicts the compactness of  $\text{cl}_{(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)}(U(0))$ . The obtained contradiction implies our assertion.  $\square$

The following example shows that the Reilly semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  with a non-annihilating homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  admits the structure of a Hausdorff compact semitopological inverse semigroup with continuous inversion.

**Example 4.27.** Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism. We define a topology  $\tau_{AC}$  on the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  in the following way:

- (i) all non-zero elements of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  are isolated points in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau_{AC})$ ;
- (ii) the family  $\mathcal{B}_{AC}(0) = \{U: 0 \in U \text{ and } \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0 \setminus U \text{ is finite}\}$  is a base of the topology  $\tau_{AC}$  at zero  $0 \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$ .

It is obvious that the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau_{AC})$  is the one-point Alexandroff compactification of the discrete space  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  with the remainder  $\{0\}$ . Also Proposition 4.21 implies that the semigroup operation in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau_{AC})$  is separately continuous. It is easy to see that the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau_{AC})$  is Hausdorff and inversion in  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau_{AC})$  is continuous.

Corollary 4.25, Proposition 4.26 and Example 4.27 imply the following dichotomy for a locally compact  $T_1$ -semitopological semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  with a non-annihilating homomorphism  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Theorem 4.28.** Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  be a locally compact  $T_1$ -semitopological semigroup. Then either  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is topologically isomorphic to  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau_{AC})$  or  $\tau$  is discrete.

Theorem 4.28 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.29.** Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  be a locally compact  $T_1$ -topological semigroup. Then  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau)$  is the discrete space.

## 5. ON THE CLOSURE OF THE DISCRETE SEMIGROUP $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ WITH A NON-ANNIHILATING HOMOMORPHISM $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$

The following proposition extends Theorem I.3 from [15].

**Proposition 5.1.** Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete dense subsemigroup of a semitopological monoid  $S$  such that  $I = S \setminus \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta) \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $I$  is a two-sided ideal of the semigroup  $S$ .

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary element  $y \in I$ . If  $xy = z \notin I$  for some  $x \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  then there exists an open neighbourhood  $U(y)$  of the point  $y$  in the space  $S$  such that  $\{x\} \cdot U(y) = \{z\} \subset \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ . The neighbourhood  $U(y)$  contains infinitely many elements of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ . This contradicts Proposition 4.21. The obtained contradiction implies that  $xy \in I$  for all  $x \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  and  $y \in I$ . The proof of the statement that  $yx \in I$  for all  $x \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  and  $y \in I$  is similar.

Suppose to the contrary that  $xy = w \notin I$  for some  $x, y \in I$ . Then  $w \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  and the separate continuity of the semigroup operation in  $S$  implies that there exist open neighbourhoods  $U(x)$  and

$U(y)$  of the points  $x$  and  $y$  in  $S$ , respectively, such that  $\{x\} \cdot U(y) = \{w\}$  and  $U(x) \cdot \{y\} = \{w\}$ . Since both neighbourhoods  $U(x)$  and  $U(y)$  contain infinitely many elements of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$ , both equalities  $\{x\} \cdot U(y) = \{w\}$  and  $U(x) \cdot \{y\} = \{w\}$  contradict mentioned above Proposition 4.21. The obtained contradiction implies that  $xy \in I$ .  $\square$

Later we need the following notions. A continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  from a topological space  $X$  into a topological space  $Y$  is called:

- *quotient* if the set  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open in  $X$  if and only if  $U$  is open in  $Y$  (see [37] and [17, Section 2.4]);
- *hereditarily quotient* or *pseudoopen* if for every  $B \subset Y$  the restriction  $f|_B: f^{-1}(B) \rightarrow B$  of  $f$  is a quotient map (see [34, 35, 3] and [17, Section 2.4]);
- *closed* if  $f(F)$  is closed in  $Y$  for every closed subset  $F$  in  $X$ ;
- *perfect* if  $X$  is Hausdorff,  $f$  is a closed map and all fibers  $f^{-1}(y)$  are compact subsets of  $X$  (see [46] and [17, Section 3.7]).

Every closed map and every hereditarily quotient map are quotient [17]. Moreover, a continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  from a topological space  $X$  onto a topological space  $Y$  is hereditarily quotient if and only if for every  $y \in Y$  and every open subset  $U$  in  $X$  which contains  $f^{-1}(y)$  we have that  $y \in \text{int}_Y(f(U))$  (see [17, 2.4.F]).

Later we need the following trivial lemma, which follows from separate continuity of the semigroup operation in semitopological semigroups.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $S$  be a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup and  $I$  be a compact ideal in  $S$ . Then the Rees-quotient semigroup  $S/I$  with the quotient topology is a Hausdorff semitopological semigroup.*

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup, where  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I = \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta) \sqcup I$  and  $I$  is a compact ideal of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I$ . Then either  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$  is a compact semitopological semigroup or the ideal  $I$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $I$  is a compact ideal of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I$ , Corollary 3.3.10 of [17] implies that  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a locally compact subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ , and hence by Corollary 4.23,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  is a discrete space.

Suppose that  $I$  is not open. By Lemma 5.2 the Rees-quotient semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$  with the quotient topology  $\tau_q$  is a semitopological semigroup. Let  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$  be the natural homomorphism which is a quotient map. It is obvious that the Rees-quotient semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$  is isomorphic to the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$  and the image  $\pi(I)$  corresponds zero  $0$  of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0$ . Now we shall show that the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$  is a hereditarily quotient map. Since  $\pi(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta))$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I, \tau_q)$ , it is sufficient to show that for every open neighbourhood  $U(I)$  of the ideal  $I$  in the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$  we have that the image  $\pi(U(I))$  is an open neighbourhood of the zero  $0$  in the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I, \tau_q)$ . Indeed,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \setminus U(I)$  is an open-and-closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ , because by Corollary 4.23 the elements of the semigroup  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)$  are isolated point of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ . Also, since the restriction  $\pi|_{\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)}: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta) \rightarrow \pi(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta))$  of the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$  is one-to-one,  $\pi(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \setminus U(I))$  is an open-and-closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I, \tau_q)$ . So  $\pi(U(I))$  is an open neighbourhood of the zero  $0$  of the semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I, \tau_q)$ , and hence the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$  is a hereditarily quotient map. Since  $I$  is a compact ideal of the semitopological semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ ,  $\pi^{-1}(y)$  is a compact subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$  for every  $y \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$ . By Din' N'e T'ong's Theorem (see [14] or [17, 3.7.E]),  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I, \tau_q)$  is a Hausdorff locally compact space. If  $I$  is not open then by Theorem 4.28 the semitopological semigroup  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I, \tau_q)$  is topologically isomorphic to  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)^0, \tau_{Ac})$  and hence it is compact. Next we shall prove that the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$  is compact. Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha: \alpha \in \mathcal{J}\}$  be an arbitrary open cover of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ . Since  $I$  is compact, there exist  $U_{\alpha_1}, \dots, U_{\alpha_n} \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $I \subseteq U_{\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup U_{\alpha_n}$ . Put  $U = U_{\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup U_{\alpha_n}$ . Then  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \setminus U$  is an open-and-closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ . Also, since the restriction  $\pi|_{\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)}: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta) \rightarrow \pi(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta))$  of the natural homomorphism  $\pi: \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I$  is one-to-one,  $\pi(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \setminus U(I))$  is an open-and-closed subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I/I, \tau_q)$ , and hence the image  $\pi(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \setminus U(I))$  is finite, because the semigroup

$(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I / I, \tau_q)$  is compact. Thus, the set  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I \setminus U$  is finite and hence the space  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$  is compact as well.  $\square$

Theorem 5.3 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be an arbitrary non-annihilating homomorphism and  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff locally compact semitopological semigroup, where  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I = \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta) \sqcup I$  and  $I$  is a compact ideal of  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I$ . Then the ideal  $I$  is an open subset of  $(\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{Z}_+, \theta)_I, \tau)$ .*

## REFERENCES

- [1] O. Andersen, *Ein Bericht über die Struktur abstrakter Halbgruppen*, PhD Thesis, Hamburg, 1952.
- [2] L. W. Anderson, R. P. Hunter, and R. J. Koch, *Some results on stability in semigroups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **117** (1965), 521–529.
- [3] A. V. Arkhangel'skii, *Bicompact sets and the topology of spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **150** (1963), 9–12 (in Russian); English version in: Soviet Math. Dokl. **4** (1963), 561–564.
- [4] T. Banakh, S. Dimitrova, and O. Gutik, *The Rees-Suschkewitsch Theorem for simple topological semigroups*, Mat. Stud. **31**:2 (2009), 211–218.
- [5] T. Banakh, S. Dimitrova, and O. Gutik, *Embedding the bicyclic semigroup into countably compact topological semigroups*, Topology Appl. **157**:18 (2010), 2803–2814.
- [6] S. Bardyla, *Classifying locally compact semitopological polycyclic monoids*, Math. Bull. Shevchenko Sci. Soc. **13** (2016), 31–38.
- [7] S. Bardyla and O. Gutik, *On a semitopological polycyclic monoid*, Algebra Discr. Math. **21**:2 (2016) 163–183.
- [8] M. O. Bertman and T. T. West, *Conditionally compact bicyclic semitopological semigroups*, Proc. Roy. Irish Acad. **A76**:21–23 (1976), 219–226.
- [9] R. H. Bruck, *A survey of binary systems*, Springer, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, VII, Ergebn. Math. **20** (1958), 185S.
- [10] J. H. Carruth, J. A. Hildebrandt, and R. J. Koch, *The Theory of Topological Semigroups*, Vols I and II, Marcell Dekker, Inc., New York and Basel, 1983 and 1986.
- [11] I. Chuchman and O. Gutik, *Topological monoids of almost monotone injective co-finite partial selfmaps of the set of positive integers*, Carpathian Math. Publ. **2**:1 (2010), 119–132.
- [12] I. Chuchman and O. Gutik, *On monoids of injective partial selfmaps almost everywhere the identity*, Demonstr. Math. **44**:4 (2011), 699–722.
- [13] A. H. Clifford and G. B. Preston, *The Algebraic Theory of Semigroups*, Vols. I and II, Amer. Math. Soc. Surveys **7**, Providence, R.I., 1961 and 1967.
- [14] Din' N'e T'ong, *Preclosed mappings and A. D. Taïmanov's theorem*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **152** (1963), 525–528 (in Russian); English version in: Soviet Math. Dokl. **4** (1963), 1335–1338.
- [15] C. Eberhart and J. Selden, *On the closure of the bicyclic semigroup*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (1969), 115–126.
- [16] R. Ellis, *Locally compact transformation groups*, Duke Math. J. **24**:2 (1957), 119–125.
- [17] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, 2nd ed., Heldermann, Berlin, 1989.
- [18] I. Fihel and O. Gutik, *On the closure of the extended bicyclic semigroup*, Carpathian Math. Publ. **3**:2 (2011) 131–157.
- [19] O. V. Gutik, *Embedding of topological semigroups into simple semigroups*, Mat. Stud. **3** (1994), 10–14 (in Russian).
- [20] O. V. Gutik, *Any topological semigroup topologically isomorphically embeds into a simple path-connected topological semigroup*, Algebra and Topology, Lviv Univ. Press (1996), 65–73 (in Ukrainian).
- [21] O. V. Gutik, *On a coarsening of a direct sum topology on the Bruck semigroup*, Visn. L'viv. Univ., Ser. Mekh.-Mat. **47** (1997), 17–21 (in Ukrainian).
- [22] O. Gutik, *On the dichotomy of a locally compact semitopological bicyclic monoid with adjoined zero*, Visn. L'viv. Univ., Ser. Mekh.-Mat. **80** (2015), 33–41.
- [23] O. Gutik and K. Maksymyk, *On semitopological bicyclic extensions of linearly ordered groups*, Mat. Metody Fiz.-Mekh. Polya (submitted) (arXiv:1608.00959).
- [24] O. Gutik and I. Pozdnyakova, *On monoids of monotone injective partial selfmaps of  $L_n \times_{\text{lex}} \mathbb{Z}$  with co-finite domains and images*, Algebra Discr. Math. **17**:2 (2014) 256–279.
- [25] O. V. Gutik and K. P. Pavlyk, *Bruck-Reilly extension of a semitopological semigroups*, Applied Problems of Mech. and Math. **7** (2009), 66–72.
- [26] O. Gutik and D. Repovš, *On countably compact 0-simple topological inverse semigroups*, Semigroup Forum **75**:2 (2007), 464–469.
- [27] O. Gutik, D. Repovš, *Topological monoids of monotone, injective partial selfmaps of  $\mathbb{N}$  having cofinite domain and image*, Stud. Sci. Math. Hungar. **48**:3 (2011), 342–353.
- [28] O. Gutik, D. Repovš, *On monoids of injective partial selfmaps of integers with cofinite domains and images*, Georgian Math. J. **19**:3 (2012), 511–532.

- [29] R. C. Haworth and R. A. McCoy, *Baire spaces*, Diss. Math. **141** (1977), 73 pp.
- [30] J. A. Hildebrand and R. J. Koch, *Swelling actions of  $\Gamma$ -compact semigroups*, Semigroup Forum **33** (1986), 65–85.
- [31] K. H. Hofmann, *Locally compact semigroups in which a subgroup with compact complement is dense*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **106**:1 (1963), 19–51.
- [32] G. Lallement and M. Petrich, *A generalization of the Rees theorem in semigroups*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **30**:1–2 (1969), 113–132.
- [33] D. B. McAlister, *0-bisimple inverse semigroups*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **28** (1974), 193–221.
- [34] P. McDougale, *A theorem on quasi-compact mappings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **9**:3 (1958), 474–477.
- [35] P. McDougale, *Mapping and space relations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **10**:2 (1959), 320–323.
- [36] Z. Mesyan, J. D. Mitchell, M. Morayne, and Y. H. Péresse, *Topological graph inverse semigroups*, Topology Appl. **208** (2016) 106–126.
- [37] R. L. Moore, *Concerning upper semi-continuous collections of continua*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **27** (1925), 416–428.
- [38] W. D. Munn, *0-bisimple inverse semigroups*, J. Algebra **15**:4 (1970), 570–588.
- [39] W. D. Munn and N. R. Reilly, *Congruences on a bisimple  $\omega$ -semigroup*, Proc. Glasg. Math. Assoc. **7** (1966), 184–192.
- [40] M. Petrich, *Inverse Semigroups*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1984.
- [41] N. R. Reilly, *Bisimple  $\omega$ -semigroups*, Proc. Glasgow Math. Assoc. **7** (1966), 160–169.
- [42] W. Ruppert, *Compact Semitopological Semigroups: An Intrinsic Theory*, Lect. Notes Math., **1079**, Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [43] A. A. Selden, *Bisimple  $\omega$ -semigroups in the locally compact setting*, Bogazici Univ. J. Sci. Math. **3** (1975), 15–77.
- [44] A. A. Selden, *On the closure of bisimple  $\omega$ -semigroup*, Semigroup Forum **12** (1976), 373–379.
- [45] A. A. Selden, *The kernel of the determining endomorphism of a bisimple  $\omega$ -semigroup*, Semigroup Forum **14**:3 (1977), 265–271.
- [46] I. A. Vainšteĭn, *On closed mappings of metric spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **57** (1947), 319–321 (in Russian).
- [47] R. J. Warne, *A class of bisimple inverse semigroups*, Pacif. J. Math. **18** (1966), 563–577.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV, UNIVERSYTETSKA 1, LVIV, 79000, UKRAINE  
 E-mail address: o\_gutik@franko.lviv.ua, ovgutik@yahoo.com